UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,022	01/22/2002	Herve Ruellan	01807.002304	7645

5514   7590   10/04/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	.	PAPER NUMBER
2141		

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2.   Applicant argued in substance, a method of "undoing a function requested by a first client station on a computer object stored on a server station of a communication network, the execution of the function being adapted to manipulate the object from an earlier state to a manipulated state, comprising the following steps: receiving a request to undo the execution of the function; obtaining the earlier state of the manipulated object; and sending a response to the first client station via the communication network, the response comprising a sum of money less than or equal to an execution cost associated with the function," in independent claims 1 and 12. The new grounds teach this feature. (See below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-4, 6, 10-13, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Cockrill et al. (6,473,740).

5.   As per claims 1 and 12. Cockrill et al. teaches a method of undoing a function

requested by a first client station on a computer object stored on a server station of a

communication network (col. 8, line 61-col. 9, line 20 and col. 15, line 61-col. 16, line 7),

the execution of the function being adapted to manipulate the object from an earlier

state to a manipulated state (col. 1, lines 14-27), comprising the following steps:

receiving a request to undo the execution of the function (col. 16, lines 8-20); obtaining

the earlier state of the manipulated object (col. 16, lines 21-31); and sending a response

to the first client station via the communication network (col. 12, lines 21-31), the

response comprising a sum of money less than or equal to an execution cost

associated with the function (col. 16, lines 32-53).

6.   As per claims 2 and 13, Cockrill et al. teaches an undo method, further

comprising a stop of generating money on the server station, associated with the first

client station (col. 13, lines 27-58).

7.   As per claim 3, Cockrill et al. teaches an undo method, wherein at said sending

step, the sum of money is less than or equal to a sum received by the server station for

the execution of the function (col. 16, lines 32-53).

8.   As per claim 4, Cockrill et al. teaches an undo method, wherein the sum of

money is strictly less than the sum received (col. 16, lines 32-53).

9.   As per claim 6, Cockrill et al. teaches an undo method, wherein the undo cost is
zero if the number of requests for executions of undone functions sent by the client
station is less than a predetermined threshold value (col. 16, lines 32-53).

10.   As per claim 10, Cockrill et al. teaches an undo method, wherein at said
obtaining step, an opposite function, which is the reverse of the function, is executed
(col. 16, lines 21-31).

11.   As per claim 11, Cockrill et al. teaches an undo method, wherein it is
implemented on a list of functions executed subsequently to the function to be undone
(col. 16, lines 8-20).

12.   As per claim 15, Cockrill et al. teaches an undo device, characterized in that it is
incorporated in a microprocessor, a read only memory adapted to store a program for
remote undoing of functions; and a random access memory comprising registers
adapted to store variables modified during the execution of said program (col. 9, lines
22-42).

13.   As per claims 16, 17, and 18, Cockrill et al. teaches a method of remotely
undoing a function (col. 3, line 54-col. 4, line 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Cockrill et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hiroya et al.

(5,754,654).

16. As per claim 5, Cockrill et al. teaches the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above

but fails to teach an undo method, further comprising a step of calculating an undo cost

associated with the undo request received; and in that the sum of money included in the

response to the first client is calculated after deduction of the undo cost. However,

Hiroya et al. teaches an undo method, further comprising a step of calculating an undo

cost associated with the undo request received (see Hiroya et al., col. 21, lines 22-34);

and in that the sum of money included in the response to the first client is calculated

after deduction of the undo cost (see Hiroya et al., col. 6, line 63-col. 7, line 8). It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Cockrill to an undo method, further comprising a step of calculating an undo cost

associated with the undo request received; and in that the sum of money included in the

response to the first client is calculated after deduction of the undo cost in order to

provide an electronic ticket vending and refunding system and a method thereof for

working when a plurality of ticket venders share only one electronic ticket vending and

refunding system in a system for purchasing or refunding a ticket from a distant place

using a telephone line for preventing forgery or illegal reproduction of an electronic

ticket (see Hiroya et al., col. 3, lines 18-28).

17. As per claim 9, Cockrill et al. teaches the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7

above but fails to teach an undo method, further comprising a step of calculating a

second undo cost associated with the undo request received and the second client
station of the communication network; and in that at the step of sending the second
response, the sum of money included in the second response is calculated by deducting
the second undo cost from the sum of money included in the undo request. However,
Hiroya et al. teaches an undo method, further comprising a step of calculating a second
undo cost associated with the undo request received and the second client station of
the communication network (see Hiroya et al., col. 21, lines 22-34: wherein it would be
obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a
second client in a communication network); and in that at the step of sending the
second response, the sum of money included in the second response is calculated by
deducting the second undo cost from the sum of money included in the undo request
(see Hiroya et al., col. 6, line 63-col. 7, line 8). It would have been obvious to one having
ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cockrill to an undo method,
further comprising a step of calculating a second undo cost associated with the undo
request received and the second client station of the communication network; and in
that at the step of sending the second response, the sum of money included in the
second response is calculated by deducting the second undo cost from the sum of
money included in the undo request in order to an electronic ticket vending and
refunding system and a vending and refunding method thereof for working when a
transaction using electronic money and an electronic ticket is executed via a telephone
line for preventing a trouble on whether the electronic money and the electronic ticket
are given or received actually (see Hiroya et al., col. 3, lines 30-35).

18.   Claims 7, 8, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cockrill et al.

19.   As per claims 7 and 14, Cockrill et al. teaches an undo method, further comprising the following steps: receiving a request to undo the execution of a function, sent by a second client station of the communication network, the undo request comprising a sum of electronic money; and sending a second response to the second client station via the communication network (see Cockrill et al., col. 12, lines 21-31), the second response comprising a sum of electronic money less than or equal to said sum of electronic money included in the undo request (see Cockrill et al., col. 16, lines 32-53). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a second client in a communication network.

20.   As per claim 8, Cockrill et al. teaches an undo method, further comprising a step of generating electronic money on the server station associated with the second client station (see Cockrill et al., col. 13, lines 27-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a second client in a communication network.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER